

Appl. No. 10/657,415  
Amtd. Dated 05/15/2006  
In response to an Office Action dated February 15, 2006.

### REMARKS

Claims 17-18, 24-32, 36-37 and 41-45, 47 and 49 are pending in the present application with claims 24-30 are currently withdrawn from examination and reconsideration of the reinstatement of these claims is respectfully requested. Claims 46 and 48 have been cancelled without prejudice. Claims 17, 31 and 36 have been amended.

#### *Request for Examiner's Interview*

The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned attorney if, after review, none of the pending claims are considered by the Examiner to be in condition for allowance. This telephone conference would greatly facilitate the examination of the present application. The undersigned attorney can be reached at the telephone number listed below.

#### *Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph*

Claims 31, 32, 36, 37 and 46-49 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph based on an alleged informality. Applicants have altered the claims to remove the modifier "first" from the claim limitation of "plurality of bonding pads". It is noted that the term "at least one" is correct and has not been amended. Applicants respectfully requests withdrawal of the §112 rejection.

#### *Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §102*

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 17-18 and 41-42 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Lau (U.S. Patent No. 5,825,084). Based on the amendments set forth in claim 17, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection and contend that the Examiner has not met the burden of establishing a *prima facie* case of anticipation.

As the Examiner is aware, to anticipate a claim, the reference must teach every element of the claim. "A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." Vergegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ 2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). "The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the...claim." Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co., 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ 2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

Appl. No. 10/657,415  
Amdt. Dated 05/15/2006  
In response to an Office Action dated February 15, 2006.

For instance, with respect to independent claim 17, the addition limitation of the "the second power bus having a voltage level less than the first power bus and located with the first power bus in a same horizontal plane of the integrated circuit package" has been added. Since Lau does not teach each and every limitation set forth in claim 17, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the outstanding §103 rejection.

*Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103*

Claims 31-32, 36-37 and 43-49 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lau in view of Applicant Admitted Prior Art. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection because a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established.

As the Examiner is aware, to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify a reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all of the claim limitations. *See MPEP §2143; see also In Re Fine, 873 F. 2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988).* Herein, at a minimum, the combined teachings of the cited references fail to describe or suggest all of the claim limitations.

With respect to independent claim 31 and 36 (as well as claim 17 as amended), Applicants respectfully submit that neither Lau or the Admitted Prior Art teach or suggest the following limitation:

*removing a second portion of the conductive material along the inside surface of the bond shelf to form a pair of separate conductive strips along the inside surface of the bond shelf with a first conductive strip of the pair of conductive strips coupled to a first bonding pad of the plurality of bonding pads coupled to a first power bus having a first voltage level and a second conductive strip of the pair of conductive strips coupled to a second bonding pad of the plurality of bonding pads coupled to a second power bus having a second voltage level less than the first voltage level, the first power bus and the second power bus are located in a same horizontal plane of the integrated circuit package.*  
Emphasis added.

Appl. No. 10/657,415  
Amtd. Dated 05/15/2006  
In response to an Office Action dated February 15, 2006.

Applicants respectfully submit that the Admitted Prior Art states that "an integrated circuit may require both 3.3 V and 2.0 V power. The additional voltage level *requires an additional conductive power plane within the package.*" Emphasis added. Therefore, the Admitted Prior Art teaches away from the claimed invention so that the combined teachings of Lau and Admitted Prior Art are not directed to the claimed methods of forming an integrated circuit package.

Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider the allowability of the claims and to contact the undersigned attorney to discuss this matter.

Appl. No. 10/657,415  
Amtd. Dated 05/15/2006  
In response to an Office Action dated February 15, 2006.

***Conclusion***

Applicants respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: May 15, 2006

By

William W. Schaeff

Reg. No. 39,018

Tel.: (714) 557-3800 (Pacific Coast)

12400 Wilshire Boulevard, Seventh Floor  
Los Angeles, California 90025

---

**CERTIFICATE OF MAILING/TRANSMISSION (37 CFR 1.8A)**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is, on the date shown below, being:

**MAILING**

**FACSIMILE**

deposited with the United States Postal Service  
as first class mail in an envelope addressed to:  
Commissioner for Patents, PO Box 1450,  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

transmitted by facsimile to the Patent and  
Trademark Office.

Date: 05/15/2006

*Susan McFarlane*

05/15/2006

Date